

Notes on a rare publication by Jacob Hübner and its effect upon modern interpretation of Hübnerian Nomenclature.

By FOSTER H. BENJAMIN.

(Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C.)

The *Lepidopterologische Zuträge*, by Jacob Hübner, Augsburg, 1820, is recommended by his student, Carl Geyer, in the "Necrolog Jacob Hübner" (1827, *Thon's Archiv*, pp. 28-31), but seems to have been disregarded by modern writers, or to have been overlooked.

It is a key to the older systems of nomenclature, and a glossary of terms. It solves the problem of interpretation of Hübner's system both by definitions and by direct comparisons. Hübner's term "stirps" is stated to be nomenclatorially equal to "*Phalanx*, Linn.," and his "coitus" equal to the unnamed group of Linnaeus marked "*" ¹.

Thus it is shown that Hübner, like Linnaeus, had only a single genus of butterflies, *Papilio*, with subdivisions. ²

Startling as this may seem to modern authors accustomed to a multitude of genera, the fact also becomes quite clear if the introductions to the various Hübnerian works are carefully read, special attention being paid to those of the *Zuträge zur Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* and of the *Systematisch-alphabetisches Verzeichniss*.

Contemporary workers did not fall into the error of considering that the "stirpes" names were intended to be of generic rank. The reviewer of Hübner's *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* for the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (19th December, 1807) very carefully put "*Papilio*" or "*P.*" before of the names of each of Hübner's plates. Thus the plate of *zygia* is listed as "*P. Lemonias maculata Zygia*," with "*Lemonias N[obis]*" as an elevation of the subgeneric *Lemonias*, Hübner, to generic rank, the reviewer considering himself responsible for this name as of generic rank. He discussed such Hübnerian names as belonging to families, "Familien" (a term commonly used by most German and English authors of that period to denote generic divisions, i.e., subgenera; see 1812, *Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, Vol. 1). This reviewer also stated that he had 2 text sheets accompanying the plates. The text pages are headed with "coitii" names, but the reviewer considered such names so trivial that he did not comment upon them, although he apparently adopted the name *Eurybia* from the text of the species *halimede* and elevated it to generic rank as "*Eurybia N.*" Latreille (1810) and Hoffmansegg (1818) each adopted this attitude, while Ochsenheimer (1816) cited the "stirpes" as "Familien [subgenera] mit gattungsamen," accepting some, rejecting others, and this was followed by Treitschke.

Furthermore, the *Lepidopterologische Zuträge* removes any lingering doubt in regard to Hübner's own attitude concerning the publication of the disputed Hübnerian *Tentamen*. Quoting from page 4, "Ich machte deshalb auch ver fünfsehn Jahren auf Veranlassung der

¹ I had previously recognised the parallel presented by the systems of Linnaeus and of Hübner (see 1926, *Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash.*, 28, 89, last paragraph) but erroneously thought that Hübner had followed Fabricius, rather than Linnaeus, in the nomenclatorial rank assigned relatively large divisions, viz., the "stirpes" (*l.c.*, p. 92).

² I consider all such subgeneric names available nomenclatorially as generic names, provided they do not violate the rules governing generic names.

Natur und ihrer Scheuung einen Versuch eines Schmettlingssystemes . . . ,” and from page 9, “Dieser Entwurf ist von dem bekannten Tentamen”³

Thus I believe the single rare *Lepidopterologische Zuträge*, considered in connection with the data presented in my 1926 paper,¹ disproves approximately two-thirds of Opinion 97 of the International Zoological Commission. This Opinion advanced three grounds for discarding the “Tentamen”: (1) publication subject to debate; (2) the contained “stirpes” names supergeneric; (3) the contained “stirpes” names “essentially” *nomina nuda* because of supposed difficulty in the interpretation of such specific names as *Papilio machaon* except by reference to subsequent literature.⁴

³ My own view is that the *Tentamen* was issued as the introductory pages of the serial plates of the *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*, and its *Zuträge zur Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge*, so that subscribers would understand the generic divisions employed and would purchase the plates as they appeared instead of waiting years for completed texts and indexes. This seems substantiated by Hübner's statements in the *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge*, p. 3, and by Geyer's statement in his obituary of Hübner, 1827, *Thon's Archiv*, p. 29. This is emphasized by Hübner's treatment of *Tentamen* names in his 1808 *Erste Zuträge zur Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* (a facsimile obtained through the courtesy of Hy. J. Turner). This treatment constitutes virtual references to the *Tentamen*. He speaks of “meinen gemeinen Leucomen”; places a new species, *gracilis*, as a dubious *Euclidia*; and a new species, *tenera*, as a false *Hypercompe*. Without the *Tentamen* such names as *Leucoma*, *Euclidia*, and *Hypercompe* would have been practically meaningless to subscribers in 1808.

⁴ While I have personally had no difficulty in interpreting these names by consulting prior or contemporary literature, the *Tentamen* groupings being in the form of a key largely based on larval characters cited as adjectives, the concluding argument of the Opinion seems largely voided by Hübner's own publication of accurate and coloured figures representing *each species name employed*. These figures were offered for sale many times by Hübner, and were advertised for sale (with two exceptions) in 1805 and again in 1806 (the *Tentamen* was published at a date between late in 1805 and November, 1806). Thus anyone who might have any doubt regarding the original authorship of any specific name cited in the *Tentamen* has only to assign that name to the author, Hübner, in order definitely to fix the name and hence to realize that each of the monobasic “stirps” names (denominated by metonymy, cf. *Tentamen*) is connected to a recognizable and prior published (or contemporary) species name. Hübner should not be condemned for refraining to repeat his own name uselessly 107 times.

***Pancalia latreillella*, Curtis.**

By T. BAINBRIGGE FLETCHER, R.N., F.R.E.S., F.L.S., F.Z.S.

This species was very briefly described in 1830 by Curtis from a specimen of which he says “I forget its locality.” In 1834 Stephens redescribed it, after Curtis, and gave locality as “near London.” Wood (1837) figured it in his *Index* and gave localities as Cumberland and near London, to which Westwood (1845) added Norbury Park. Stainton's *Manual* (1859) gives Lewes, Pembury, Epping and near Edinburgh as localities, but since then there seem to have been few records of its capture. I have, as *latreillella*, one specimen labelled “Rannoch; G. H. Conquest; 17.v.1911”; Mr H. Stringer writes that the Bankes Collection contains a series taken at Aviemore in June 1909 and that the British Collection at the Natural History Museum also